

## Meeting Minutes

**Subject:** RFCA Standard Operating Protocol for Facility Disposition, responsiveness summary

**Date:** July 28, 2000

**Location:** Building 060, RFETS

**Attendees:** Steve Tarleton, Fred Gerdeman, Jeff Stevens, Dyan Foss, John Corsi, Mary Harlow, Shirley Garcia, John Marler, Carol Lyon, Lee Norland

**Objective of the Meeting:** To go over the responsiveness summary and obtain concurrence of proposed responses.

**Meeting was chaired by:** Jeff Stevens


**File:** Administrative Record

---

The meeting was an informal roundtable in which everyone asked questions. The responsiveness summary, a copy of the ER transition section, and a copy of the redlined text that addresses explosives was distributed to all that attended. The responsiveness summary was addressed in three main topics.

1. The first major comment from everyone was the environmental restoration transition and activities. It was explained that where possible ER transition was incorporated into the document; however, there were some comments that were just outside of the RSOP scope. Some specific questions were asked on the wind speed and dust control. It was agreed at the end of the discussion that everyone was generally pleased with the responses.
2. The second major comment addressed explosives. It was explained that the RSOP has been modified to require additional stakeholder involvement if explosives are used and that this involvement is to be initiated at the scoping meeting. Some specific questions were asked on how often explosives may be used. Tarlton presented that states opinion the since RSOP only covers building that meet the free release criteria and given the additional public involvement, that is was satisfactory to CDPHE and something they could support. It was agreed at the end of the discussion that everyone was generally pleased with the responses.
3. The third major comment addressed leaving items three feet below the final proposed grade that meet the free release criteria. It was explained that this approach is based on industry standard practices and that all items would be evaluated based on the Water Balance Study. Some information was given on the status and content of the Water Balance Study. It was agreed at the end of the discussion that everyone was generally pleased with the responses.

It was agreed that the stakeholders would review the responsiveness summary and provide any comments by Wednesday, August 2. It was agreed that Jeff would set up a time with Mary and Shirley to tour Building 771 and take a look at JHAs.



ADMIN RECORD

SW-A-004086